

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIV, No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1920

WHOLE No. 372

IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS

ON THE POSITION IN THE CLAUSE OF NE AND UT IN CERTAIN DOCUMENTS OF COLLOQUIAL LATIN. By WILLIAM T. ROWLAND, Ph.D. Pp. vii + 44. \$1.00 net.

"The author explains the preverbal position of *ne* and *ut* in colloquial Latin and applies this explanation with good results to certain vexed problems of modal syntax". *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, Jan. 12, 1920.

THE DREAM IN HOMER AND GREEK TRAGEDY. By WILLIAM STUART MESSER, Ph.D. Pp. ix + 105. \$1.50 net.

The author, who has made extensive collections of dream incidents and episodes in Greek and Latin literature, discusses their increasing complexity, growth and refinement, or decay, as an artistic literary device.

VERGIL AND THE ENGLISH POETS. By ELIZABETH NITCHIE, Ph.D. \$1.50 net.

"Miss Nitchie's book is a faithful chronicle of the perverse interpretations, romantic distortions, superficial imitations, scholarly reconstructions, and sympathetic appreciations that Vergil has suffered at the hands of English writers". *N. Y. Nation*, Aug. 9, 1919.

CLASSICAL ECHOES IN TENNYSON. By WILFRED P. MUSTARD, Ph.D. Pp. xvi + 164. \$1.25 net.

Tennyson's study of the classics is well known and through his poems one often lights upon classic allusions and quotations and upon passages where a subtle or unconscious memory of some ancient poet seems to have determined the choice of a word or the turn of a phrase.

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK. A Bibliographical Survey. By FINLEY MELVILLE KENDALL FOSTER, Ph.D. Pp. xi + 146. \$1.50 net.

"This bibliography of translations from Greek into English appears, as far as we can test it, to be remarkably complete". *London Times*, Feb. 20, 1919.

WAGNER'S DRAMAS AND GREEK TRAGEDY. By PEARL C. WILSON, Ph.D. \$1.50 net.

COSTUME IN ROMAN TRAGEDY. By CATHARINE SAUNDERS, Ph.D. Pp. 145. \$1.25 net.

THE SATIRE OF SENECA ON THE APOTHEOSIS OF CLAUDIUS. By A. P. BALL, Ph.D. Pp. vii + 256. \$1.25 net.

STUDIES IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL TERMINOLOGY OF LUCRETIIUS AND CICERO. By KATHARINE C. REILEY, Ph.D. \$1.25 net.

STRESS ACCENT IN LATIN POETRY. By ELIZABETH H. DU BOIS, Ph.D. Pp. v + 96. \$1.25 net.

DE INFINITIVI FINALIS VEL CONSECUTIVI CONSTRUCTIONE APUD PRISCOS POETAS GRAECOS. By C. J. OGDEN, Ph.D. Pp. 60. \$1.00 net.

THE BELLUM CIVILE OF PETRONIUS. By FLORENCE T. BALDWIN, Ph.D. Pp. 263. \$1.25 net.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

LEMCKE & BUECHNER, Agents

30-32 EAST 20TH STREET

NEW YORK CITY

NEW EDITION

Pearson's Essentials of Latin

Now Meets the New Latin Requirements in New York State

By HENRY CARR PEARSON, Principal of the Horace Mann School,
Teachers College, Columbia University

This new edition of Pearson's Essentials of Latin for Beginners now meets all of the very definite requirements set forth in the new Syllabus.

It contains, in addition to the original matter, 136 pages of new material. The 136 pages may also be purchased in pamphlet form.

The new Reading Matter includes:

5 Pages of Ritchie's Story of Perseus
11 Pages of Heatley's Gradatim
9 Pages of Eutropius's Breviarium

Special lessons have been added covering the required work in vocabulary drill, word formation and derivation, uses of the genitive, compound verbs, and the word lists of the first and second half years to be memorized.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

How Can You Keep Latin Alive in Your School?

By making the subject attractive to the pupil at sight,
by challenging his interest, by using

Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin, Revised Why?

Its lessons are short. Its explanations are clear.

Its rules are the simplest. Its order is logical.

Its reading matter is connected, and so interesting.

Its illustrations are an invitation to study.

Ginn and Company

70 Fifth Avenue

New York, N. Y.

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XIV

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 18, 1920

No. 3

THE FUTURE OF LATIN¹

Historians are not easily stampeded by the present outcries against Latin. Like the gods of Lucretius they look calmly upon vast stretches of time and are consoled by the knowledge that Latin has been in worse straits before. Mistress of almost the whole Roman world under the Caesars, Latin was in grave danger of extinction in the period of the barbarian invasions. This fate was averted largely by the Western Christian Church, which preserved the Latin language, and, incidentally, many of the treasures of pagan Latin literature. A second severe crisis came in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, but we must postpone discussion of that until we have taken a broad and general survey of our subject.

A complete history of the Latin language does not exist, but, when attempted, it will fall naturally into three grand divisions. The first is the period ending about 400 A.D., during which the language of a tribe on the Tiber gradually became the natural or adopted tongue of the greater portion of the Mediterranean world. The second period comprises the thousand years from about 400 A.D. to 1400 A.D., when Latin was the language of the medieval learned class and was in a very effective way the international language of all Western Europe. As a result of the sharp break between the pagan and the Christian world the excellent classical Latin of the first period was seriously neglected. The third period embraces the five centuries or more which have elapsed since the rise of Italian humanism in the fourteenth century. During this time the classical Latin of the ancient Romans has come fully into its own, but at the expense of medieval Latin, which has been despised and almost forgotten. From century to century in modern times Latin has given way among scholars to the vernaculars, and long ago ceased to be an international medium of communication. To-day it is generally classed as a 'dead' language, and many predict that the time is not far distant when it will be studied only by antiquarians and professors of comparative philology.

On the contrary, I wish to express my firm belief that the world is on the threshold of a new era in the history of Latin, when this language will become the universal language among all civilized peoples and thus will enter upon a career of influence and usefulness far transcending its position in even the period when the Roman Empire was at the height of its glory. This new mission of Latin will inevitably involve a revival of interest in medieval Latin, partly because of its intrinsic value, which is gradually being recognized, but chiefly because it will furnish us the best models when we begin to fashion Latin to serve as the universal language of the modern world.

A medievalist naturally is much interested in medieval Latin and looks forward eagerly to the crumbs which will fall to it from the table of Latin seated as the mistress of the world. We shall therefore revert to the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, that critical period when the natural development of Latin was so seriously interrupted that it began to succumb rapidly to the vernacular languages. Outwardly all seemed well with Latin. The great Latin Church was more splendid and powerful than ever. In the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries it had helped to develop a most powerful ally, the medieval University, in which Latin flourished as the sole medium of instruction. Throughout the West, Latin was the undisputed international language, and, through the rapid expansion of Western Europe in those times, bade fair to become the universal language of the civilized world. Nevertheless grave dangers lurked for Latin in those halcyon days. Although it was used so widely in Church and State and School, and even in the markets of the time, the study of the Latin language itself and of Latin literature was shamefully neglected. In the twelfth century a lively interest had developed in those things, but the extraordinary devotion of the medieval Universities to philosophical, theological, and practical studies stifled almost all interest in language and literature and thus did irreparable harm to the normal development of Latin.

The Italian humanists of the fourteenth century took the world by storm when they reopened for a starved generation the wonderful treasures of pagan Latin literature. So enraptured were these enthusiasts by the literary language of Cicero's days that they became disgusted with their own Latin and began to wage bitter war against it. Once again Latin seemed to have entrenched itself so strongly that nothing could ever prevail against it, for in all the Schools of Western

¹This paper was read at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Central Section of The Classical Association of the Pacific States, held at the University of California, June 30-July 1, 1920. It was printed as part of the Proceedings of the California High School Teachers' Association, which were published as the August number of the Sierra Educational News. The plea for medieval Latin made by Professor Paetow, who is Professor of Medieval History at the University of California, deserves a wide audience. Reference may be made to his book, *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*, University of California Press (1917), and to his article, *Latin as a Universal Language*, in *The Classical Journal* 15:340-349 (March, 1920).

Europe men began to pore over it with passionate devotion.

Yet all along, from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth, Latin was being exposed to the utmost dangers. Both the scholars of the medieval Universities and the humanists alienated vast masses of people from Latin. The medieval Universities did not cultivate literature, nor did they study the language in a scientific fashion. On the one hand, they discouraged men of letters, and, on the other, they failed to adapt Latin to the needs of ever-widening classes of people for every-day intercourse. The humanists sinned in another direction. They laid excessive stress upon the literary form of classical Latin and thus frightened away all those who found it too difficult or too irksome to master Ciceronian phrase for ordinary purposes. The result was that greater and greater numbers of the intellectual class resorted to the various vernaculars which had grown up among the illiterate populations in all portions of Europe since the barbarian invasions. If Latin had been cultivated as it should have been in the Middle Ages, Dante probably would not have written his *Divine Comedy* in Italian; and if the humanists had not insisted solely upon a stereotyped form of old Latin, Shakespeare might have written Latin plays.

The modern world of scholars, following in the footsteps of the humanists, has done its full share in alienating people from Latin. This has been accomplished in part by a good deal of cold and lifeless instruction of classical Latin. But that has not been so serious as the almost utter neglect in modern times of medieval Latin language and literature. In the Middle Ages pagan classical Latin was not properly cultivated. That most seriously hindered a true understanding of the elegancies and the possibilities of Latin. Reacting against this medieval mistake, the modern world fell into an error almost as great. By condemning medieval Latin to oblivion, it foolishly broke with its own past civilization, and thus ceased to comprehend that Latin has been and still may be the most effective international language which the world has ever seen.

Naturally, medieval Latin has not been forgotten altogether in modern times. The religious controversies of the sixteenth century stimulated an interest in the records of the ancient history of the Church and led to the publication and the study of many medieval Latin writings of all kinds. In the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries sporadic attention was paid to medieval literature, even by philologists. Some of you may remember the plump little volume by the youthful professor Polycarp Leyser, entitled *Historia Poetarum et Poematum Medii Aevi*, printed at Halle, in 1721. Everybody knows the famous work of Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, which appeared in 1678. Although this work stood at the end of a series of such attempts in the seventeenth century, it has never been superseded even to this day.

The romantic movement of the first half of the last century did much to attract attention to medieval

Latin. It is astonishing, however, to find how little Latin philologists were affected by that drift towards the Middle Ages. The classical tradition was too strong to allow many of them to step off the beaten path. Consequently, in the nineteenth century, as in previous centuries since the rise of humanism, historians and jurists did more than philologists with the Latin language and the Latin writings of the Middle Ages. For good or ill these men of the nineteenth century worked largely with patriotic fervor under the stimulus of the rampant feeling of nationalism. Philologists who were strongly influenced by this nationalistic fever were apt to be drawn into Romanic and Germanic philology. Thus it came about that Romanic philology has been brought to such a stage of advancement that its *Handbücher* are beginning to rival those of Ivan von Müller, while medieval Latin philology can boast of none. One may venture the opinion that the cart was thus placed before the horse and that Romanic philology will never rest upon firm foundations until we have mastered the Latin of the Middle Ages. Gröber, in his *Grundriss*, devotes a chapter to medieval Latin literature, but it is sad to see the noble mother of modern vernaculars supported grudgingly by her ungrateful children.

In recent years there has been a laudable tendency on the part of a considerable number of philologists to turn their attention to the Latin of the Middle Ages. On the Pacific Slope, and in particular in the University of California, there has been no more striking evidence of this drift than the presence of Professor E. K. Rand, of Harvard University, as Sather Professor of Classical Literature, 1919-1920. In his lectures on Classical Culture in the Middle Ages, Professor Rand revealed what a rich harvest the Middle Ages offer to Latin students. Medievalists naturally rejoice at this turn of the tide. We have always considered it unreasonable that medieval Latin has had such scant attention. We can understand but we cannot sympathize with the humanists of the fifteenth century who tried to abolish medieval Latin root and branch. In the Middle Ages Latin lived a wonderful life of influence and usefulness. It is foolish to try to laugh or reason it away. It stands there unalterable, constantly challenging our attention. So stood the Latin Classics on the shelves of medieval libraries until the humanists came and in opening their pages revealed a new world. We do violence to history when we try to omit whole centuries in the life of a thing which has lived so long and so honorably as Latin. You will kill a tree if you peel off a foot of bark all around the middle of its trunk.

A revival of interest in medieval Latin would be desirable, because it would lead to a better comprehension of Latin as an organic growth, as a live thing which has seen wonderful periods of expansion and influence, and which may see them again. At present such a revival could be brought about in only one way, namely, by advocating Latin as the universal language of the modern world. This is neither the place nor the com-

pany in which to argue that Latin has the best claim to that important mission. It were better for us to begin immediately casting about for ways and means to push its claims. In so doing we shall naturally be induced to give much attention to medieval Latin. We know, and can know, comparatively little about the Latin of the street, the market, and even the School, of Rome in Cicero's time; but we can find out almost all there is to know about the Latin which flourished in the medieval Schools and Universities as a most effective international language. An understanding of this practical medieval vehicle of thought, together with our solid knowledge of classical literary Latin, would enable us to construct a modern form of the language which would be a well-nigh perfect medium of easy and effective intercourse between the present inhabitants of this globe.

The world is clamoring for a universal language. If we are convinced that Latin is suitable for this purpose, we should have the courage of our convictions and proceed to devise machinery for its propagation to this end. No time could be more propitious than ours. In numberless ways the world needs reconstruction, and no factor in international relations is bigger or more urgent than the introduction of a common tongue among all mankind.

The question of Latin as a universal language should be raised in every possible gathering, national and international. At the earliest moment an international committee should be formed to study the problem from every angle. The first steps should be elementary and practical ones. The fundamental requirements would be suitable manuals for the teaching of Latin in the simplest and most direct way. Enough money should be got from foundations for the advancement of knowledge, from learned societies, and from philanthropic associations and individuals to offer attractive prizes for the best grammars, readers, conversation books, composition books, brief histories of the Latin language and literature throughout the ages, and short dictionaries. In these days of slim academic purses great numbers of excellent scholars throughout the world would be drawn into this competition by large cash prizes. Numberless forgotten corners in Latin language and literature would be searched eagerly to meet this new demand. With the best of these approved manuals at hand many eager teachers would rush to test them in their classes. The aim should be to provide teachers who could speak and write the Latin of these manuals with ease and fluency, to have them begin with very young children and to give them enough time to teach their pupils to speak, write, and read the language thoroughly. Children so trained would become centers of interest and would go out as disciples ready to carry Latin into ever-widening circles.

Meanwhile, scholarly research and creative work in these new fields would go on apace and seek its own reward, as it did in the time of the humanists. It would not be long before scholars of the world would

begin a vast historical dictionary of Latin starting at the present *terminus ad quem* of the great Thesaurus, which would never again be obliged to beg pitifully for help, as it is doing to-day. Verily, the future of Latin may be greater than its past. It is not unreasonable to believe that the time has come when the thousand years of Latin scholarship, from about 400 A.D. to about 1400 A.D., which the humanists blighted with their bitter scorn, will now receive due attention. When that imaginary chasm has been bridged, the full strength and glory of the Latin language may burst upon the modern world in a new revival much more startling than that which dawned on Italy in the fourteenth century. Such a fair and comprehensive view of Latin could be brought about by making our contemporaries see that what Latin did for Western Europe in the Middle Ages it could do for us to-day—bind the world together by a common tongue.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

LOUIS JOHN PAETOW.

PARIS-ALEXANDER

In Classical Philology 8.160-171, Professor John A. Scott put forward the brilliant hypothesis that the character of Hector was the creation of Homer, and that Paris was the traditional leader and champion of the Trojans. This is convincing except in one very minor detail: Professor Scott thinks (161) that Alexander is the Greek translation of the Trojan name Paris. The present writer was led to a different conclusion by noticing how easily the modern Greeks change their names. In America, for example, Papadopoulos and Petrakopoulos enter into partnership under the firm-name of Papas and Poulos. Twenty years ago there lived in a little village of Elis a family by the name of Papapollachroniou, 'Long-lived-priest's-son'; the family name of the old priest was entirely forgotten. A Greek of my acquaintance informs me that this change of names is very common in primitive communities. On the island of Thasos a family moved into town from a hamlet called Theologos. The members of this family were referred to as 'the Theologites'. Before long their real name was forgotten and Theologitis took its place. In the days when emigration from the island had not become common a certain fellow called George returned from the United States, was dubbed 'the American', and thereafter went by the name of Georgios Amerikanos. A bungler who made pretense to the blacksmith's trade was called in derision 'Chalkeas', and soon Smith had taken the place of his family name.

The same tendency to change names existed in ancient Greece, as the names of Plato, Theophrastus, and others indicate (Nitzsch, *Sagenpoesie der Griechen*, 187, gives other cases). It may be questioned whether Telemachus and Eurysaces were not appellatives of this kind, rather than names given at birth. Certainly we have in Homer two clear instances of the displacement of a given name by an appellative. The beggar who disputes with Odysseus the right to a place on the

latter's own threshold was named Arnaeus by his mother, but all the young men called him Irus because he carried messages (Iris was the heavenly messenger): the poet refers to him as Irus, never as Arnaeus (Odyssey 18.5 ff., 75, 96, and five or six times more in the same book). At Troy itself Hector's little son, whose given name was Scamandrius, was called Astyanax by all except his father, 'for Hector alone preserved Ilios'.

It seems more natural, therefore, to assume that Alexander was the name which the Trojans themselves applied to their champion and which to a considerable extent had displaced his given name, than that it was the Greek equivalent of Paris. The Iliad gives no hint of a diversity of language between Trojan and Greek which might have justified such a translation. Furthermore, the name 'Defender' (Alexandros) would be more appropriate for a recognized champion than for a prince at his birth.

Still another explanation of the alternative name of Paris is possible. Mr. D. D. Luckenbill (Classical Philology 6.85 f.) queries whether Greek Alexandros is not the equivalent of Mitannian Alakshandu. If Alakshandu, king of Arzawa (about 1300 B.C.), was an early Alexander, then it is conceivable that the crown prince of Troy may have been called Alexander at his birth, and that Paris is the appellation.

Neither of the above suggestions weakens Professor Scott's theory about Hector, which is to be regarded as one of the most useful contributions in the way of a hypothesis based on strong evidence which this generation has made to the appreciation of the creative genius of Homer.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

REVIEWS

A Short History of Rome. By Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagallo. Translated from the Italian by George Chrystal. Volume I, The Monarchy and the Republic (754 B.C.-44 B.C.); Volume II, The Empire (44 B.C.-476 A.D.). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1918, 1919). Pp. VII + 510; V + 516.

About half of Volume I of this new History of Rome and the first part of Volume II form practically an epitome, with some rearrangement of material but with negligible changes in points of fact, of Ferrero's well known work, *Greatness and Decline of Rome*. Even the phraseology of the earlier work has here and there been preserved, particularly in the case of striking, epigrammatic remarks. Here is one illustration. The new work states (1.474): "He had been made prisoner by his own victory"; in the earlier work, with reference to the same situation, we read (2.305): "He was the prisoner of his own victory".

In the Preface the authors make the following statement:

Our chief aim has been to bring out clearly the connection of these larger events.

Now, generally speaking, the work successfully carries out this purpose; but at times the effort to keep together events occurring at the same time leads to an effect almost choppy. Pages 371-377 of Volume I present this order of events: Lucullus in the East; Spartacus's rebellion; Lucullus in the East, and Pompey in Spain; Crassus against Spartacus; The election of Pompey and Crassus; Lucullus in the East; the consulship of Pompey and Crassus; Lucullus in the East. Other examples can be readily found.

The period of the Julian and the Claudian Emperors receives fairly full treatment in Volume II, as is to be expected where Tacitus is available as a source. The period deserves detailed study; but perhaps the court intrigues centering in Messalina, Agrippina, Poppaea Sabina could be adequately narrated in smaller space, with the result that room would be left for more important matters of the development of government and civilization. Ferrero, while criticising Tacitus, has himself fallen under his spell. It is very natural that this should happen: Ferrero is a modern Tacitus, brilliant, epigrammatic, with a very real interest in moral and social conditions, in personalities, and with the ability to make the most of a dramatic situation.

In the latter half of Volume II a great many details, particularly in the history of the years of anarchy in the third century A.D., are treated in a very small compass, with any number of dates. One gets the impression of an attempt to include everything, though there is not space for it all. A more general treatment of this period, with the omission of matters not significant, might make for better reading.

A real blot on the work is the attitude assumed toward German scholarship in historical research. The authors indulge in many flings at "the critics", more in the first volume than in the second, and usually, as might be expected, they make their statements general, without references to definite works. A good example of the attitude is found in 1.5:

During the nineteenth century there flourished in the universities of Germany a historical school which, by the Germanization of a Greek word, termed itself "critical". The besetting sin of this school is its determination to extract at all costs from the abysses of the past historical data which are hopelessly lost.

Of course this prejudiced attitude is due to feelings aroused by the Great War; but, in spite of its emphasis, it does not prevent the authors from referring frequently to German scholars as authorities. It so happens, by ill chance, that on the same page there follows an example of their own critical acumen:

The ancient Romans, being nearer in time to that event, were in a better position than we to know when their city was founded.

With regard to statements of fact presented and theories advanced, this review will generally be confined to those parts of the work in which new material, not already published in Ferrero's earlier works and often reviewed, appears.

The authors advance at some length, without accepting it, the theory that Rome was founded by the Etruscans:

The Etruscans were better fitted than the Latins of the eighth century B.C., to establish a flourishing emporium on the banks of the Tiber.

However, they do not feel the proof strong enough, and so are on the fence between the theory of a Latin origin and that of an Etruscan origin. On the authority of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, they are willing to believe that under Tarquin Rome actually became, by conquest, the capital of Etruria and that hence came the Etruscan influence on Roman civilization in the regal period. Such a description of affairs may be true, but who can prove it? It is better with Heitland, for example, to be very cautious in handling the details of the origins of Rome.

Hand in hand with this theory of early power is the idea, which is made prominent, that Rome in the regal period was a really great commercial and industrial city, and a "power at sea", in fact one of the leading cities of the Mediterranean. The chief proofs advanced in support of this theory are the record of the founding of Ostia, the port, in this period, the large size of the early city, as indicated by Servius's wall (which, however, scholars do not by any means all attribute to the regal period), and the "improvements in the low-lying parts of the city", of which the Cloaca Maxima is visible evidence. The apparent weakness and insignificance of Rome in the early Republic are then treated as a decided set-back at the time of the eviction of the kings. That Rome was weaker for a time after the regal period seems true, but for such an exaggeration of her early powers there is little good evidence. Later, the authors themselves state that Rome "was not a commercial power" even at the beginning of the Punic Wars, 250 years afterward, but that at this time was made "the second effort of Rome to become" one.

The *concilium plebis* is merged, in this history, into the *comitia tributa*, and as an assembly of the plebs only; but no reasons are given for ruling the *concilium plebis* out of existence.

In discussing the Second Punic War the authors advance the theory that Saguntum was "the occasion . . . the real cause . . . was the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul by Rome". Carthage was humiliated by Rome's extension of her sway, while she herself was forbidden to cross the Ebro. It seems to the reviewer that such a conception of the situation enlarges entirely too much the sphere of Carthage's vital interests. This is not to deny that Hannibal had knowledge of conditions in Northern Italy, and that his route to Italy is a proof that he meant to make the most of them.

After the Second Punic War, when Rome might have been expected to exploit her powers to the utmost, "a sudden change came over Roman policy", which resulted in "an aversion to territorial aggrandizement". The facts, of course, are known; but Rome's expansion at the time of the conquest of Carthage may not have

been due to imperialistic plans, but to a feeling that to keep Carthage out Rome must be in—a defensive policy. There would then be no need of explaining a great change of policy. Rome had been, and still was, conservative.

Differing from his early work, Ferrero now explains "the Jugurthine scandal" by his interpretation of the political situation at Rome, and not by the theory of bribery. The scandalous stories in Sallust originated among the democrats, who were violently opposed to the senatorial party. Proof of the new idea is lacking.

In the study of "the Augustan Republic" there is a general agreement with the larger work, and further an insistent claim that before Dio Cassius no writer "appears to suspect that Augustus had hidden a monarchy under the old republican forms". But the authors can not support their views by such statements. Tacitus (Annals 1.3, 9) had precisely the idea of a monarchy concealed.

As a part of the new constitution of Augustus one might expect a discussion of the reorganization of the *cursum honorum*, and its importance for the Empire. But nothing appears. And there is no apparent use made, as a basis of a study of military organization, of such a work as Domaszewski's *Rangordnung*.

Proper recognition is given to the fact that Tiberius's policy was to have the Senate take an active part in governing; but again there is overemphasis in stating that "he wished to reconstitute the ancient power of the aristocracy". It seems to the reviewer that the transference of the elections to the Senate was merely a necessary development, but might well be construed as a plan to add to the powers of the *princeps* rather than to those of the Senate.

Vespasian carried through a "renovation of the senate by the addition of elements drawn from the Romanized provinces of the West". This act of the Emperor is properly stressed as adding real elements of strength to the Senate; but that these elements gave rise to hatred and opposition to Domitian, as this work would have it, and to his final overthrow, can not be proved, and that a "Republican Renaissance" began under Trajan, from this influence, is far from certain. It remains to be proved that in the second century the Senate gained any power, and that the Emperor was merely *primus inter pares*. This view is, as the Preface indicates, due to Ferrero alone, and is stressed by such statements as this: "At the end of 104 the senate was again faced with the necessity of sending an expedition" against Dacia. In criticism of this theory it should be noticed that several of Pliny's letters give us clear insight into the attitude of Senators toward the Emperor. He is plainly their ruler, gracious, kindly, even friendly, but their ruler, and they feel his superiority. And is not the growth of bureaucracy in this period an evidence of an increasing tendency to centralize government in the hands of the *princeps*? Were not the friendly relations between Senate and Emperor in this "era of good feeling" due to a frank recognition by the Senate of its own

and the Emperor's actual positions, a condition promoted by the dying-out of old aristocratic traditions and the growth of new influences, partially at least as a result of Vespasian's reformation? Did not the personal character of the 'good' Emperors contribute to this condition?

At least two letters reported in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, one of Hadrian, another of Avidius Cassius, are accepted as genuine documents with no proofs, or references to proofs, given.

Caracalla "apparently excluded senators from all military command", according to this history. It would be difficult to prove it (see C. W. Keyes, *The Rise of the Equites*, and S. E. Stout, *Governors of Moesia*, 37, 64).

Again an instance of overemphasis is found in this statement:

When Diocletian donned the purple the Graeco-Roman empire of Trajan and of Hadrian was already almost entirely transformed into an Asiatico-barbarian empire.

The meaning is that civilization had so changed, not merely the form of government. Is it not more nearly correct to say that the Graeco-Roman civilization, though significantly affected by the Orient, still lived on?

Little need be said of the form and the style of this new history. As is usual in Ferrero's publications, the reading is generally very easy and highly interesting, though 'journalistic'. The expression, "New and unexpected developments" frequently occurs, and the combination "new and tremendous disaster" appears not seldom. But there is more to the work than merely interesting writing. New points of view are offered to the reader, and proper emphasis is placed on matters sometimes neglected. As illustrations may be noted the treatment, in Volume I, of "progress" over against "corruption", and the emphasis on economic change and class struggles. In the period of the Empire, the survey of the provinces, given in connection with the account of the reign of Hadrian, the development of law, matters of taxation, the effects of debasing the coinage, and in particular the struggles and changes in the later Empire due to the rise of Christianity are all presented in an interesting and helpful way.

To conclude this part of the review, we may say that the work seems to have too much originality in its treatment of the origins of Rome, to be rather inadequate in the history of the first century A.D., due probably to too much dependence on Tacitus (one must use Tacitus, but must be able to get away from him also), and to present too many details in portions of the later history. In general it is the sort of work that the reviewer should like to assign for reading, rather than to make the sole text-book of a course.

The work of translation has been very satisfactorily done, and the printing is clear; but there are neither maps nor illustrations. A good-sized Index concludes each volume.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

G. A. HARRER.

Latin Poetry from Catullus to Claudian. An Easy Reader. Edited by C. E. Freeman. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1919). Pp. vi + 176.

The editor states in his Preface that the volume "is mainly intended for those who have some knowledge of Virgil and Ovid, but who have not at present much opportunity for more general reading". His object has been "to choose passages which are easy as well as beautiful", his brief notes are "only meant to save time spent in referring to other books", he "set out with a determination to make them short", and regrets only that he has "not succeeded in making them shorter than they are". There are seven selections from Catullus, nine from Vergil, ten from Horace, seven from Tibullus, six from Propertius, eight from Ovid, five from Lucan, seven from Statius, and three from Claudian. A brief notice on the author precedes each group of selections. There are also a vocabulary and an index of proper names.

The reviewer finds himself interested in this little volume not only as a miniature anthology for the casual reading of the graduate humanist, well suited as it may be to that purpose, but also as a possible text-book for College classes. He has just finished reading very pleasurably, with a class of Sophomores, Professor Durham's handy little edition of Plautus's *Amphitruo* (Allyn and Bacon), which is annotated after much the same fashion, except that its brief commentary appears, for convenience's sake, at the foot of the page. It was his observation that the brevity of the notes tended to concentrate attention on the text, that the frequent translations of unusual phrases, subject to explanation *ex cathedra*, made possible a desirable rate of speed in translation, and that their freedom from labored erudition did not prevent the *cathedra* from becoming erudite when occasion warranted.

Of course this raises the whole question of the end and function of classical Readers, and the reviewer would not be misinterpreted as belittling the efforts of more laborious editors, many of whose so-called College texts seem to him nevertheless to be designed rather for the instructor than for the class. Professor Shorey, in the Preface to his edition of Horace, alludes amusingly and truly to "the young student in haste" and to "the critical and grammatical discussions found in all school editions which he always skips". Not unnaturally. The Freshmen and the Sophomores who read Horace and Plautus under my guidance average eighteen recitation hours per week. Figure for each the old-fashioned two hours of preparation and you get something in advance of the eight hour day, including Saturdays. And after that, speaking preceptorially, before that, following *studiosus*, who after all decides the matter, the 'extra-curricular activities'! Forsooth, *dum loquimur, fugerit invida aetas!*

A partial solution, obviously, is to carry Latin into the field of extra-curricular activity. The same class that read with me Professor Durham's *Amphitruo*, minus much erudition, had just finished the *Andria*, and a group of them took the trouble to 'put it on', in English

translation, before a tittering house. Costumes from Tams! Flute music by an excellent clarinetist. Rehearsals every evening for a month, faithfully attended. They plan more of these 'revivals'. Before the end of this one they had done a deal of thinking about the interpretation and the characterization of a Latin comedy. I think they fairly caught the spirit of it. Certainly they stand on very intimate relations with Pamphilus and Davus and the rest of that desperate crew. Still they were weak on *faxint* and the derivation of *ilico*. It is at best a compromise. Mr. Freeman's book suggests the possibility of a definite system of training in rapid reading which would do much to help solve the problem.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

JOHN R. CRAWFORD.

Titī Livi Ab Urbe Condita Liber XXII. Edited by John Pyper. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1919). Pp. 196.

The reviewer has found Livy a successful text for Freshmen, though it has also been his experience that Book I, because of its anecdotal character, is better adapted to the modest rate of speed in translation of which they seem ordinarily capable. However, any addition to our reading texts of Livy is welcome, and it is a vivid story that describes the events leading up to the battle of Cannae, the details of that disaster, and the effect it produced upon the city.

The booklet contains a brief Introduction (5-11), Notes, covering 53 pages (96-148), an Index of Proper Names (149-152), and a vocabulary (153-196). The notes are clearly written in untechnical language, presumably well adapted to the use of the English School boy, and certainly to that of the American College Freshman, whose preparation in Latin is limited and whose zeal for the perusal of learned scholia is negligible. As a typical example of the editor's workmanship take his note on 56.1:

in hanc sententiam, etc., 'when this proposal was unanimously adopted without debate': instead of waiting to be called upon to speak, a senator who agreed with the proposal of another could, by walking over to him, indicate his support of the proposal; he was then said *pedibus ire in sententiam alterius*.

There are no futile references to Grammars, to be skipped by "the young student in haste". On the other hand, there are not a few cross-references on puzzling constructions, valuable in that the appeal is to the student's normal curiosity, awakened by his actual translating experience. An example is the note on 56.4: *in illa tempestate*, 'at that time', with the suggestion 'in the circumstances'. If time alone were indicated, *in* would be omitted; cf. 35.7 *in tali tempore*.

In short, like Mr. Freeman's Easy Reader, the book is well adapted to the use of classes wishing to read a Latin author not too intensively but with comparative ease and rapidity—the sort of reading in which our

students, both in the Secondary Schools and in the Colleges, ought to be more effectively trained.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,
Easton, Pa.

JOHN R. CRAWFORD.

The Odes and Secular Hymn of Horace Englished into Rimed Verse Corresponding to the Original Meters. By Warren H. Cudworth. New York: Alfred A. Knopf (second edition, 1917). Pp. xx + 161. \$1.50 net.

Ecce iterum! The lure of Horace to translators young and old is irresistible. The simple thought, the narrow range of subject, the artful and elusive structure of the phrase, the grace and melody of the rhythms revealing themselves under analysis perennially challenge student and imitator. Mr. Cudworth follows, among many illustrious predecessors, especially John Conington, but *proximus longo intervallo*. He is convinced

that any version of the poet, in order to convey, even in a shadowy manner, the general effect of the original, must maintain in its verse structure an approximate equivalence to the Latin. Each translated ode must conform in general appearance, division into strophes, and length and number of verses to the prototype, and each instance of any given Horatian meter must invariably be rendered into its English analogue as selected by the translator. Types of odes should be rigidly adhered to, and the fact that Horace uses a given measure to sing such varying themes as the duties of patriotism and the lure of wine, the companionship of friends and the praises of the gods, should excuse no deviation from the principle. Then, too, some degree of the compactness of thought and brevity of expression that characterize the original must be attempted—some of Horace's own terseness must be brought into play, if he is at all adequately to be reproduced.

The 37 Alcaic odes, 26 Sapphic, 12 Second Asclepiad, 9 Third Asclepiad, 7 Fourth Asclepiad, 3 First Asclepiad and 2 Alcmanic are all translated into English iambic stanzas, imitating in the length of the verses the general appearance of the original. Only five odes are in other rhythms. The two spring-songs (1.4 and 4.7) are in anapests; 2.18 (*Non ebur neque aureum*) and 1.8 (*Lydia, dic, per omnes*) are in trochees, while the unique ionic a minore ode to Neobule is in dactyls. In these cases, with some inconsistency, the author admits that he has "been led quite as much through a desire for variety as through any feelings of individual fitness".

The publishers make this announcement:

This translation seeks to reproduce for the modern reader the probable effect of the Latin upon Horace's contemporaries and the men of the two or three succeeding generations. . . . The whole has been given a conscious turn toward the formalism of the school of Pope in the belief that the characteristics of the Queen Anne literature are closely analogous to that of the Augustan Age.

We therefore have to deal with a clearly stated theory as to the best form for a metrical translation of Horace. In his essay On Translating Homer Mr. Matthew Arnold says,

It is disputed what aim a translator should propose to himself in dealing with his original. Even this preliminary is not yet settled.

And again, in specific criticism of Mr. Newman's translation of the *Iliad*, he writes:

I advise the translator not to try to rear on the basis of the *Iliad* a poem that shall affect our countrymen as the original may be conceived to have affected its natural hearers.

Mr. Arnold's analysis and constructive criticism are familiar; he was more eager to assist future translators of Homer than to tilt with Mr. Newman, whose scholarship he respected, but whose theories of literary propriety impressed him unfavorably.

Without question Mr. Cudworth pondered well the peculiar qualities of Horace's workmanship. Some odes are much superior to others. In spite of a superficial uniformity in Horace's lyric technique there is a surprising variety in his cadences, and his economy of words. His diction is not archaic; there are few eccentricities, no strange "horned beasts" of words running amuck; there are inimitably clever combinations of familiar words in telling phrases; subtle interweaving of phrases; and emphasis secured by throwing significant words into bold relief. The monosyllabic nature of the English language of itself dooms any attempt to reproduce the effect of the Latin cadences. A Tennyson might boldly experiment in English *Alcaics* in a single poem; but he could not have sustained the effort in a translation of Horace without violating the Horatian felicity and the native genius of the English language.

Mr. Cudworth, of course, understands the predicament. He has clearly defined his position as to the general external characteristics of Horace's manner. But does he rise or fall with Horace? Does his touch become light or heavy, grave or gay, as Horace's mood and manner vary? Only fine feeling for the Latin verse and a genius, almost recreative, combined with a pitiless self-criticism could achieve even a qualified success in so difficult a field. But whatever assurance he may entertain as to the validity of his ideal of translation, Mr. Cudworth speaks with becoming modesty of his own muse; nor is it unfair judgment of his experiment to affirm that his Englished Horace is often not recognizable as the reincarnation of the Venusian. He has, indeed, often caught the spirit and the cadence of phrase and strophe; yet the whole of a poem is much more than the sum of its material parts. The highly artificial ode to Pyrrha (1.5) well illustrates the elusive qualities of the poet. The ode is a dramatic monologue; the scene is outlined in an appeal of surprise; irony and humor point the moral. But how exquisitely turned are the lines:

qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,
qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem
sepat, nescius aurae
fallacis.

In the Latin there is facile grace, haunting melody; and the inevitable word fits into its predestined place. And

could infatuation and coquetry be more simply, more effectively, pictured? Mr. Cudworth conceives the situation thus:

Who now, bewitched beneath thy golden spell,
Hopes thee for aye his own, lovely for aye,
Unweeting of the stormwind fell
So soon to blow!

Mr. Conington translates as follows:

Who now is basking in your golden smile,
And dreams of you still fancy-free, still kind,
Poor fool, nor knows the guile
Of the deceitful wind!

There cannot be any doubt that something has evaporated from the Latin, something so characteristic of the Latin and having perhaps no exact counterpart in English. Individual judgment must determine whether a given version produces an effect approximate to that of the original.

I do not believe it to be fair to dismiss with superficial criticism a labor of love such as this translation unquestionably appears to be. May the little book add many a deft phrase to our store of interpretations and find many sympathetic readers. Personally I have found that the studied formalism and archaistic "poetic" diction produce on me an effect quite different from that intended. If a jealous lover of Horace can be called unbiassed, such is my unbiassed feeling. But will not some second Matthew Arnold gird himself to the task of teaching the present generation how the definitive English translation of Horace should be conceived and written? No Valerius Cato, 'most learned of grammatic knights', but some one who, both knowing Latin and appreciating good poetry, may be bold enough to outface the critics!

UNION COLLEGE,
Schenectady, New York. GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals

II

- Bulletin of the John Rylands Library—April to November, 1910, A Bilingual Papyrus of Cicero. Rylands Greek Papyri No. 61 [a fragment of the Second Catilinarian, in parallel columns of single words or small groups. Written between 400 and 500 A.D., in the Latin mixed uncial style. The Greek also shows irregular uncials with some admixture of cursive writing. Professor W. M. Lindsay is quoted for the view that this manuscript shows that the bilingual text of the Second Catilinarian from which the famous Philoxenus Glossary (see *The Classical Review* 31, 155, 188) was compiled was in use in Egypt in the fifth century. The home of that papyrus was in Italy. Hence he suggests that this speech had been published with a Greek word for word translation as a School book, and was used for teaching Latin in Greek-speaking countries and for teaching Greek in Latin-speaking countries]; Metrical Fragments in III Maccabees, J. Rendel Harris [an argument that fragments from Greek tragic literature are imbedded in this work—e. g. a fragment dealing with the fall of Troy and another dealing with the tyranny of Phalaris].
- Discovery—June, The Discoveries in Crete, George Glasgow.
- Deutsche Literaturzeitung—Jan. 3, L. Kraus, Die Poetische Sprache des Paulinus Nolanus (M. Manilius); Feb. 7, Karl Trüdinger, Studien zur Geschichte der Griechisch-Romanischen Ethnographie (A. Riese); May 15, R. Hirzel, Der Name. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen (E. Fraenkel); F. Schwenn, Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern (R. Ganschinietz).
- Educational Review—April, Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature [emphasis is laid on the difficulty of using in English distinctions included in the section on mood, distinctions which are "necessary for Greek and Latin"]; May, Education For Democracy, C. F. Ross. G. H. G.